

NDP Briefing Readout

From: "Pickard-Tattrie, Seth" <seth.pickard-tattrie@justice.gc.ca>
To: "Khalil, Samantha" <samantha.khalil@pmo-cpm.gc.ca>
Cc: "Steinhouse, Alexander" <alexander.steinhouse@justice.gc.ca>
Date: Wed, 23 Feb 2022 00:58:48 +0000

Hey Sam,

See below readout from NDP briefing. Main focus of questions were a) general criticism of disinformation, concern of foreign actors and money being involved in misinformation and hate, and their role in this protest, and if we are adequately handling the threat b) the revocation threshold and c) the inadequacy of the initial reaction to the Convoy.

Seth

Green – Critical on links to national security and section 2 of the CSIS Act, gunman in Rideau Centre, why was this not included in the original declaration. Why wasn't the extremist threat identified in the Declaration, not nearly enough about ideological violent extremists.

Samantha (DOJ) – Definition of threat must be assessed for purposes of EA meaning its met threshold

Green – Was subsection (d) included?

Samantha – did not peg to particular definition

Angus – Very concerned because clear we have lost narrative in disinformation war, speed narrative emerged and sunk into conscious of country. Dealing with level of misinformation that is insane, never seen a protest that was financed this way. We need to make case to public very quickly that this was organized action. Need to be able to say serious concerns foreign interference and a threat to the State of if politicians (like the NDP) are jammed and leave behind destabilizing gap (if they flip on the EA I assume he meant). We should look at the work of the US Congress on offshore disinformation.

Mme Drouin – Agree with your points, will consider them.

(started taking multiple questions at a time, so some of this may seem disjointed)

Collins – Can you confirm there is no possibility for use of these powers outside of context of convoy (ie pipeline protest in BC). What is the threshold for revocation.

Drouin – I don't think so, it was sculpted to address the situation, but challenge is defining whether or not related to the convoy. If not related, law enforcement will not use the powers.

Davies – Feel out on a limb without any hard evidence from the Government every day we continue to use the EA. Province of Ontario still has State of Emergency. Very clear laws against blocking a highway and blocking an intersection. Why were local law enforcement unable to enforce properly/give tickets?

Drouin – highlighted financial measures, admitted the injunction helped too, but Act was needed.

PS Official – Tickets were issued, initially was supposed to be a peaceful protest so allowed trucks in but they didn't leave and grew to a situation where police force was overwhelmed, culminating elsewhere with close of four points of entry so emergency situation arose and no idea where the money was coming from. ERO allowed police to deal with.

Threshold that Emergency situation existed on 14th, over last seven days have watched it get under control. When it is under control, we will revoke.

Dennis (RCMP) difference provincial laws that could be used but needed the EA. For example, getting tow trucks was difficult and EA made it possible to compel assistance.

Davies – Why were existing laws inadequate? Can you give a precise description on how financial powers are being used right now, numbers etc?

Bachrach – I feel some questions have not been answered well, they were vague and confusing. Its hard to follow the plot from the Declaration, to the criteria in the EA, to section 2 of the CSIS Act.

These definitions seem to suggest ideologically motivated extremism, but were not in the Declaration or the rationale. Why was this language not in the Declaration? Reiterated question on existing laws being inadequate.

Cannings – 6 border crossings in riding, one had an incident, wondering whether in future EA Act will be used to handle or can they be handled by adequate RCMP presence. Why do we need the EA at border crossings?

Drouin – everything could have been dealt with as one offs, but not all at once, it grew out of control and beyond any one's individual ability to manage.

MP Iodout – More about extremism and foreign interference, but focusing her debate on that she is getting a lot of derogatory and hate emails, feels like we (MPs) have access to information from these emails that the Government doesn't have. Target on their backs for supporting EA. Why are we keeping the Act going for 30 days instead of 3 days? Supports keeping because of rhetoric and hate. Notes she doesn't feel charges are strong enough to be a deterrent, seeing everyone get charged with mischief.

Kwan – with respect to the financial measures, is there any evidence when accounts are frozen whether a relationship with foreign influence? Once EA is lifted, will accounts unfreeze? How was there a sign on the highway telling people where to go to park their trucks? Some of the hateful emails she has gotten are from elected or recently elected officials, are they shielded from actions?

Ashton – Nobody overjoyed to support the EA, support was reluctant. Concern about Indigenous protest, concern about police state, have heard that Black Canadians are having a tougher time at Ottawa checkpoints.

Officials – noted re threatening emails, described three places they can go – Sergeant-at-Arms, law enforcement, social media companies. Mischief is usually an arrest charge, can add afterwards, also noted that Mischief can be up to 10 years in jail depending if summary or indictable offence.

Previously noted will not be used outside context of convoy, don't think we have set a precedent.

Green – Asked about ITAC, can you explain how they have been involved and have any intel from them you can share?

Official – ITAC produces classified, highly classified, and open source information. Its sole purpose is to assist police authenticate products that look like threats. RCMP look at threats through criminal lens, CSIS looks at NatSec, etc.

Green – notwithstanding a lot of the threat online, is CSIS engaged on this, are we in agreement that white supremacists and nationalists are a threat to our democracy? Why do we keep underestimating them, like here and Jan 6^t?

Mike (official) – CSIS only gets involved if a foreign state actor gets involved, as designed right now. You are correct that IPMB (I swear this was the acronym but no idea what it means, took to mean white supremacists and nationalists per the question) threats are now a major threat and its grown in the last two years, and its hard to assess and we are working on it.

Kwan – Can we get stuff in writing

Natalie – maybe, we will check.

Seth Pickard-Tattrie (he/him | il/lui)

Director of Parliamentary Affairs | Directeur des affaires parlementaires

Office of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada

Cabinet du ministre de la Justice et procureur général du Canada

Seth.Pickard-Tattrie@justice.gc.ca